

# The American Presbyterian.

John A. Weir

15 July 69

New Series, Vol. V, No. 35.

\$3 00 By Mail. \$3 50 By Carrier.  
50cts Additional after three Months.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1868.

Evangelist, No. 1162.

## American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1868.

### THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON REUNION.\*

We regard the very large majority given in the Assembly at Albany in favor of the Joint Committee's Basis as a triumphant testimonial to the Calvinistic orthodoxy of our Branch of the Church, and to the entire safety and expediency of a union with us on that Basis. By that vote, in the face of a minority composed of accomplished and hitherto unquestioned leaders of that Branch, the Assembly gave honorable proof of its own advance in a safe and orthodox liberality. Supplemented and explained by the *Answer to the Protest*, in which the Auburn Declaration, or doctrinal Protest of the New School minority of 1837, was recognized in the fullest manner as "embracing all the fundamentals of the Calvinistic System," it marks a turning point in the history of that body, which has hitherto been understood all over the Christian world, to assume an attitude of superior orthodoxy, especially towards the so-called New School Church. We regard the "Old School" Branch as having by their action at Albany committed themselves in doctrine to all that is essential to the New School position. They have not become Taylorites, nor have they accepted the monstrous heresies charged on the New School in Dr. Humphrey's Rip Van Winkle Protest, nor have they consented to allow those heresies in others; (the New School never did;) but they have solemnly accepted as orthodox the doctrinal statement of the minority of 1837, who were cast out of the Church as unsound, with indignity and violence; and they have put the exclusive and revolutionary majority of that era of persecution, in a minority far more decisive than that occupied by the New School men of that day.

But the majority of the Old School Assembly had no idea of treating the minority of 1837 with the violence which was done to the minority of 1837. On the contrary, they did every thing possible to conciliate them, consistent with the adoption of the Joint Committee's Plan of Reunion; indeed, they opened themselves to grave charges of inconsistency, for the sake of showing reverence to the fathers, whose wishes they were so decidedly opposing. They adopted that Committee's plan *in toto*, and then joined with the minority in a unanimous resolution to seek a radical alteration in the doctrinal article, provided our Assembly would agree to the alteration. And when that could not be effected they adopted, with equal unanimity, and telegraphed to our Assembly, a declaratory resolution which only the Answer to the Protest could save from the most damaging significance.

It is therefore not remarkable that *The Princeton Review*, which represents the defeated, but complimented minority, is, by turns, displeased and hopeful at the action of the Albany Assembly. With the Basis itself, *The Review* is no better pleased than was its Editor, Dr. Hodge, in the Assembly which adopted it. The great objection urged, is the ambiguity of the doctrinal article. In the judgment of the *Reviewer*, Dr. Hall's resolution, telegraphed to our Assembly on Monday night at 10 o'clock, to the effect that no doctrines condemned by either Assembly should be tolerated in the united Church, gave the first article a sense satisfactory to the Old School; while our Assembly adopted the Basis as allowing all doctrines, in the united Church, which had been allowed in the New School Church. *The Reviewer* says, pp. 117, 118:

"We wish explicitly to guard against the conclusion hastily adopted by many that the doctrinal basis in the first article of the proposed plan of union binds the Old School to tolerate any doctrines that may have hitherto been allowed in either body, in case it should be adopted. This we have shown to be the New School construction of it. . . . But it is equally capable of a construction which permits the Old School to determine for themselves, and in accordance with their past history, what is essential to the integrity of the Calvinistic system, and what doctrines at any time allowed in either church are inconsistent with it. We are therefore not bound to the lesser construction of it, when it is equally capable of the stricter."

We agree with Dr. Hodge as to the ambiguity of the language of this first article, and, as our readers are aware, we corresponded with the author of the phraseology in question, Dr. Gurley, on that very point. But we regard all this ambiguity as removed, and a New School sense as an authoritative to the words, in the Old School as well as the New School Assembly; in latter, by the *Answer to the Protest*, which

We take for the text of the following discussion two concluding articles in the *Daily number of the Princeton Review*: "The General Assembly," and "The Protest and Answer." We have spoken of them as product of one mind, but the inconsistency of their opinions, as noticed in the concluding part of our editorial suggests a dual authorship and a question whether Princeton is agreed in itself on these important elements in the reunion movement.

corresponds to Dr. Hiekk's report in the New School body. Dr. Hiekk says, "If the man is not out of the pale of his former Church's orthodoxy, he cannot be in danger from any ecclesiastical court's rigidity or bigotry." Now the New School views of orthodox doctrine, if embodied in any document outside the Confession and the Bible, are found in the Auburn Declaration. But the Albany Answer to the Protest describes this very document as an authoritative statement of the New School type of Calvinism, and as embracing "all the fundamentals of the Calvinistic faith." If then, the only published declaration of the measure of our orthodoxy is recognized by the other party to the union as embracing all that is essential to orthodoxy, we have beforehand perfectly harmonious explanations of the meaning of the doctrinal article. Dr. Hiekk's Special Report and the Albany Answer have taken from the doctrinal article all the ambiguity which Dr. Hodge and ourselves equally observed. But this interpretation is subversive of the position of the *Review* as above quoted. It takes from the Old School, in the event of Re-union, the right "to determine for themselves, what is essential to the integrity of the Calvinistic system, and what doctrines at any time allowed in either Church are inconsistent with it." The doctrines of the Auburn Declaration are already declared by the Old School Assembly to be consistent with it, at the same time that they are described as representing the New School type of theology. The elements of confusion and conflict growing out of a contradictory interpretation of the Basis, which we ourselves once feared, and which the *Reviewer* continues to anticipate, as a consequence of Re-union on the Basis, are removed, unless the able minority of the Old School should undertake to make trouble; in which case we predict that they will have a hard road to travel.

But the *Reviewer* casts in his lot with the Protesters. The Auburn declaration, equally with the New School subscription of the Confession, fails, in his view, to establish the orthodoxy of our body. "It is a fact," says this obstinate accuser of the brethren, "beyond all dispute, that the errors specified in the protest, are taught, without let or hindrance, in the New School body!" "These doctrines," he continues, "are taught with the greatest clearness in books published by the New School Committee, and over the names of some of their most distinguished men"—a pure fabrication of a mind panic-struck with absurd fear of re-union with the objects of its groundless, but inveterate "prejudices, and a libel upon a respectable business agency, whose character for orthodoxy is an essential element of its success.

But had the *Reviewer* been prepared to allow that the Auburn Declaration truly represented the New School type of theology, it nowhere appears that matters would have been much mended in his esteem. "We demur," he says, "to the statement [in the Answer to the Protest] as to the satisfactory character of that Declaration." And this is all he does say on that very important matter. He "demurs," and then is silent. To not a few, this silence is equivalent to a reluctant admission of the orthodoxy of the Auburn Declaration; but we are not, in this generation probably, going to enjoy the spectacle of a frank confession, in the *Princeton Review*, of a position which clearly involves the orthodoxy of the New School Church. Yet the *Review* is too sagacious to venture to assail the orthodoxy of that Declaration.

But the inconsistent conduct of the majority at Albany gives a certain tone of hope to the *Reviewer*. He takes great courage from the Hall-Humphrey amendment which he regards as settling the Old School interpretation of the Basis. Much does he also expect from the movement to procure an alteration in the doctrinal article, unanimously recommended by their Assembly to ours, and which, with a certain absence of a fine sense of propriety, is still pushed in the other body, and favored by some of the majority, in spite of its failure to pass our body, and in spite of the understanding that, in case of failure, the Joint Committee's Basis, whole and entire, was to be the sole objective point of their efforts. We are not now concerned with the seeming inconsistencies and weaknesses of our friends in the majority of the other Assembly; but we wish to know what comfort the *Reviewer*, on his own ground in these articles, can possibly take in the prospect of the unqualified adoption of the Confession of Faith as the doctrinal Basis of Reunion? He says: "When both bodies confide in each other sufficiently to ratify union on this granitic stratum, then may we hope it will abide on this deep and broad foundation." But how is such confidence possible towards a Church which, in spite of its present subscription to the Confession, notoriously and freely allows, both in the pulpit and by the press, the teaching of the

errors specified in the Protest?—a Church which, in the *Reviewer's* opinion, no more proves the sincerity of its adherence to Calvinism by its subscription to the Westminster Standards, than the rationalistic Lutherans of Germany, the Socinian clergy of Geneva, the Deistic-Reformed Church of Holland, and the Arminian Episcopalians prove their orthodoxy by subscribing to the various orthodox Confessions of their churches and countries. "It matters not," says the *Reviewer*, "how orthodox that [the Auburn] Declaration may be. There is no more difficulty in reconciling the adoption of that Declaration and the toleration of the specified errors, than the adoption of the Westminster Confession with such toleration." In other words, the New School men have no sense of the moral obligation of subscription to any doctrinal basis. And it cannot possibly mend matters to persuade us to sign the Confession pure and simple. Even the truly orthodox among us, says the *Reviewer*, insist on tolerating the errors which the Protest denounces.

On any such opinion of the New School body, the *Princeton Review* is bound, in all consistency, and upon all fair and honorable principles, to discountenance utterly the attempt at Re-union on any Basis. Advocacy of Re-union on the Confession is but an enticement to our branch to involve ourselves more deeply in gross sin, and peril to our souls. The *Reviewer* cannot believe that the mere acceptance of the Confession as a basis of Re-union, would at once purge off the heresies complained of in the Protest, from those who have already subscribed the Confession in other relations. He must intend either (1) to create disgust in the minds of the New School with the Re-union movement, and break off the intended match, or (2) to get us under the harrow of that great Old School majority, which is expected by many in the United Church, and to proceed at once to discipline, as was intimated by speakers during the debate in the Albany Assembly.

The utterances of the *Princeton Review*, as the representative of the badly injured minority, perhaps do not deserve the extended notice in our columns. But we cannot overlook the disposition shown by the majority of the Old School body to conciliate, and, in part, still to follow the well-remembered tones of their old leaders. The complete emancipation of the Old School Church from the shackles of exclusivism is yet so far a problem, that the declarations of the *Princeton Review* continue, for the present, to have some significance.

### TEMPERANCE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

By a Special Correspondent.

The Prohibitory Law has been prostrated in Massachusetts. The reverse is greater in seeming than in reality. Whole columns of *The American Presbyterian* might be profitably given to a full history of this case; but to spare your space I will condense to the utmost what I have to say.

Boston is jealous of its waning trade. Men who come on here to buy a few hundred yards of prints, bluster against "Puritanic laws." That against smoking in the streets was repealed to please them. Many good men think that an entire closure of bars, theaters, gamblers' dens, and brothels would drive to New York valuable customers who love *miscere utile cum dulci*. Hence a strong bias against Prohibition in Boston. Boston manufactured over \$1,000,000 of liquor in 1860 in eleven establishments, averaging over \$100,000 each. It imports liquors also for nearly all New England, and its retail trade, connived at by the city police, has been enormous.

The influence of Harvard University is against total abstinence. Some half-dozen of its professors testified against Prohibition before the Legislature. The amiable Agassiz, an authority in the geological world, even ventilates his opinions in the *Agricultural Report* for 1868, and before the Legislature boldly said "intemperance is unknown in the vine-growing countries!"

The Romish priests were unanimous against Prohibition. This is suicidal in them, for alcohol is all that has saved us from the sway of their disciples. It kills a larger portion of them than ratsbane does of our rats, or "cobalt" or arsenic of our flies. But it is a costly *paddy-lane*, as it also crams our jails and poor-houses with Irish. I saw two wash-tubs of codfish soak for the breakfast of the Catholic inmates of Tewksbury almshouse on a Friday morning. It is funny to see the priests sawing off the limb on which they are perched. But a teetotal Papist is very apt to leave his Church. For an exterminator give me the press rather than the still. Bishop Eastburn, of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, also testified on that side. (So did four of the most eminent Congregational ministers of the State; Dr. Blagden, of the Old South; Dr. Adams, the distinguished author; Dr. Todd, once of Phila-

delphia, and his son in Boston. They are pastors of four churches, equal perhaps to any other four in the denomination, unless we call H. W. Beecher a Congregationalist. Dr. Adams even dared to say that he thought "that the strong sober common sense of the clergy of our denomination is that way." As the General Association voted unanimously the other way, not four months after, "sober common sense" must have staid away.

Up to this time the cry had been "Repeal the law because it cannot be executed." Gov. Andrew interposed his veto repeatedly to prevent the organization of a State Constabulary demanded by the friends of the law; and the second year they accepted the best he would let them have. He afterwards became the paid lawyer of the liquor-dealers to overthrow the Prohibitory Law, sharing that labor and its emoluments with Linus Child, the "venerable Boston merchant" who advocated the cause of the American Board at Harrisburg, being also its legal adviser and a member of its Prudential Committee. It had now become clear that the law would be enforced unless repealed. The unsentenced convicts who could escape jail only by a victory at the polls were numbered by the thousand. They had exhausted the last legal quibble, and now resorted to a secret organization, the P. L. L., which extended over the State with the pristine power of the Know-Nothings. It sent to Boston the meanest Legislature (so its very friends confess) that ever met there. They say that Gov. Bullock only secured his re-election by a pledge not to veto its license-bill. Its majorities were ample, but obtained by working inside of the two parties, not in a fair field. They were months in making their bill. The Governor denounced it in a message, and let it pass unsigned.

But he vetoed the abolition of the State Constabulary, and it still remains a most efficient institution, formidable to gamblers, and both able and willing to enforce the Prohibitory Law should it be re-enacted in the very words in which it stood when the Supreme Court overruled every possible pretence of law that legal acumen could pick in it. The experiment of the Prohibitory Law is as perfect a success as the magnetic telegraph: the question now for the people of Massachusetts, will they have it or no? This question cannot be evaded or long postponed. The Republicans will be obliged to nominate Lieut. Gov. Claflin for Governor this fall, in response to the demands of the prohibitionists. The men who disgraced our legislative halls last winter can never go again, but the power that has successfully defied the national arm and compelled Congress to remit its severe whisky-tax, may yet thwart the will of the people again and again in ways we cannot see.

The Congregationalists are somewhat sore on the present aspect of the question. There cannot be over a half dozen of its ministers who are openly opposed to the Prohibitory Law, and the lay minority is equally insignificant in numbers. But this minority have wealth and position.

To them it was quite natural to wish to see the action of the General Association of 1867 reversed, or at least superseded by something more palatable. It is whispered that the details of the meeting of 1868 were arranged in Boston. For intrigues of this kind, free-jointed Congregationalism affords more opportunity than stiff Presbyterianism of procedure.

A Boston lawyer was Moderator. Mr. Childs was on the Business Committee and on that on Temperance. Dr. Adams led the devotional exercises of the last morning. A speaker at that meeting who introduced the topic of temperance was stopped. The resolutions on temperance were acceptable to the anti-prohibitionist and were reported too late for debate. Dr. Todd preached the sacramental sermon. Dr. Adams broke the bread. The former preaches total abstinence, but the latter does "not believe in that doctrine." Aside from their agency in the defeat of prohibition, there was no reasonable objection to this assignment of parts; but it seems to have been made as a demonstration that the church was willing to sustain them in the course which they had taken; whereas it was but their position and their talents that prevented their action from ruining them. But the plotters if such there were, received one check. A resolution commending prohibition, introduced with difficulty, was passed *nem. con.*

The connection of Dr. Adams and Linus Child with the American Board is an unpleasant matter. How much it has to do with its defeat no man can know. But a body transacting its business in any way cannot easily change its lawyer. No conceivable legal lore could supply the loss of many years' experience in this peculiar field. And when either force of public sentiment or death shall sever Mr. Child's connection with the Board, his loss will be long and

Ministers \$2.50 H. Miss. \$2.00.  
Address—1334 Chestnut

and gifted and the denomination is so nearly of one of the questions of total abstinence quarter of a century ago, that it can afford to tolerate a both. Still both have stood at the head

I hope I have said enough for nearly a present temporary defeat, suffer from it on only possible remaining possibility. The greatest triumphs of right are the humanity and justice over the combination of self-interest, wealth and the Rum in Massachusetts, but for this victory have been where Rebellion in the South have been, had Booth's bullet missed its mark. Both have but postponed their inevitable fate. Not another experiment is needed and our next complete victory in the legislature can not fail to suppress all open retail traffic in alcoholic liquors as a beverage. SCHUYLER.

At the recent Yearly Meeting of the Society of [Orthodox] Friends in this city, Daniel M'Pherson, a Western minister, was present on a "religious visit," but, as is common in the West, not in the "Friendly" garb. Twenty prominent Friends thereupon signed and sent him a paper expressing their "settled conviction" that it would not be proper for him "to visit in the capacity of a minister, any of the meetings comprised in this Yearly Meeting, or to occupy a seat in front of any meeting," basing this result on the fact, that he did not value the testimony of religiously concerned Friends, who are conscientiously bound to uphold with faithfulness the Christian testimony to plainness of dress, speech and behaviour." As all Quaker business is despatched in this informal way, according to the feelings of "concerned Friends," Daniel had only to submit, or there would have been a quiet and impressive row over his recusancy.

Bishop Colenso's heresies are bearing fruit in strange quarters. Quite a number of the younger members of the Society of Friends in Lancashire, and especially in Manchester, have avowed their agreement with the results of his Biblical criticism. As might be supposed the "weightier" friends are greatly concerned at this state of things. Some of them are inclined to trace sceptical tendency to the Quakerish exaltation of "the inward Light" above the written Word, and a book has recently appeared, in which a member of the Society charges a Deistical and sceptical tendency upon Barclay's Apology itself,—the very Calvin's Institutes of Quakerism.

Some philanthropic people have been filling papers and magazines with not very edifying details about the wickedest man in New York, the keeper of a low dance-house, and his conditional conversion. It appears that he has been using the temporary notoriety secured for him by these foolish puffs to gain custom. It would be very hard to fix on "the wickedest man" in such a city as New York, but old analogies would lead us to look for him inside as well as outside the churches.

The project to divide this Episcopal diocese into two, having failed to secure the votes of the two-thirds majority of churches and communicants in the proposed new diocese of Lehigh—as required by the late diocesan Convention—on the first ballot, another "grand rally" is to be made to secure this result. Bishop Stevens urges it as required by the feeble state of his health, and assisted at a meeting recently held at Reading with this view. If this new movement should result in changing the vote of those with whom the matter rests, the new diocese will be geographically much larger, but numerically much weaker than the diocese of Philadelphia. The strength of the denomination lies in the city itself, where the Episcopal Church, mainly through accessions from the old Quaker element, is more powerful and influential, and, as a consequence, less bigotted and intolerant than in any other city of the continent. But there is room for improvement even here.

Romanist papers, of Europe, announce, for about the twentieth time, and with as much truth as in the other nineteen instances, that Dr. Pusey has "made his peace with the Church," and joined the Romish communion. That cry of "Wolf" has been made so often that no one will believe it when it does come, if it ever does.

Prussia is to add another to the list of International Exhibitions. It is to be located near Berlin, and opened in 1871.